

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Date of Incident:	Feb. 23, 2018
Time of Incident:	11:13pm
Location of Incident:	[REDACTED]
Date of COPA Notification:	Feb. 26, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	2:05pm

Complainant, [REDACTED] was driving westbound on Roosevelt Road when he was stopped by the police and issued a ticket for a broken headlamp. Mr. [REDACTED] alleges that the traffic stop was racially motivated.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	[REDACTED] Star [REDACTED], Employee [REDACTED], DOA [REDACTED] 1998, Field Training Officer, Unit [REDACTED], [REDACTED] 1998, Male, Hispanic
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] 1971, Male, Black

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer [REDACTED]	1. Mr. [REDACTED] alleged that on Feb. 23, 2018, at approximately 11:13pm, in the vicinity of [REDACTED] Road, the accused racially profiled him in that he stopped him because he was Black in Violation of Rule 6. 2. Mr. [REDACTED] alleged that on Feb. 23, 2018, at approximately 11:13pm, in the vicinity of [REDACTED] the accused issued Mr. [REDACTED] a false ticket in Violation of Rule 2.	Unfounded
		Unfounded

IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

Rules

1. Rule 6 – “Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.”
 2. Rule 2 – “Any action or conduct which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
-

General Orders

1. G.O. 02-04, Part III.B Prohibiting Regarding Racial Profiling And Other Bias Based Policing – “Members making routine or spontaneous law enforcement decisions, such as investigatory stops, traffic stops and arrests, may not use race, ethnicity, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, disability, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, marital status, parental status, military discharge status, financial status, or lawful source of income, except that officers may rely on the listed characteristics in a specific suspect description.”
-

V. INVESTIGATION

a. Interviews

In a digitally recorded statement on Mar 1, 2018, the complainant, [REDACTED] related that he was driving westbound on Roosevelt when he was pulled over by a White police officer driving a marked SUV. Mr. [REDACTED] stated that the SUV made a U-turn as he drove past, prior to stopping him. During the stop, the officer told Mr. [REDACTED] that his headlight was out and proceeded to issue him a ticket. Mr. [REDACTED] asked the officer if he could exit the vehicle to look at the headlight but the officer told him no. The officer instructed him to fill out the ticket, get the light fixed, and that “they” will throw the ticket out. After being issued the ticket, Mr. [REDACTED] drove to his daughter’s house and took pictures of his illuminated head lamps and later went to the [REDACTED] District to get information about filing a complaint. In his interview, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that he did not have any damage to his vehicle and that his headlights were functional. Mr. [REDACTED] alleged that he was racially profiled because he is Black and the involved officer was White.¹

b. Digital Evidence

Mr. [REDACTED] took photographs of his vehicle approximately fifteen minutes after he was issued a citation. The photographs show a Hyundai sedan with both head lamps illuminated.²

¹ Att. 7

² Att. 18

In the in-car camera footage, Officer [REDACTED] tells Mr. [REDACTED] that he stopped him because one of his headlights was out. Mr. [REDACTED] explained to Officer [REDACTED] that he had just replaced his bulb earlier that afternoon and asked if he could try to fix it. Officer [REDACTED] told him that he would have to fix it at another time and proceeded to issue a violation notice.³

c. Documentary Evidence

On 23 Feb 18, at 11:13pm, at the location of [REDACTED] Citation [REDACTED] was issued to [REDACTED] for a broken headlamp in violation of Municipal Ordinance 9-76-050b.⁴

PDT messages documented Officer [REDACTED] traffic stops and LEADS inquiries on February 23, 2018, indicating that his stops involved drivers of different races and sex.⁵

Additional Evidence

According to records from the City of Chicago website, Mr. [REDACTED] did not contest the ticket and was required to pay a \$25.00 fine.⁶

VI. ANALYSIS

COPA recommends a finding of Unfounded for both Allegations -- racial profiling and issuing a false citation. After Mr. [REDACTED] was pulled over for a broken headlight, he informed the officer that he had just replaced the bulb earlier that day. Mr. [REDACTED] asked Officer [REDACTED] if he could try to fix it and Officer [REDACTED] told him that he would have to fix it later. In his COPA interview, Mr. [REDACTED] denied having problems with his vehicle and failed to disclose that he attempted to replace the bulb a few hours prior to his encounter with Officer [REDACTED]. Although Mr. [REDACTED] submitted pictures of his vehicle displaying two working headlights, it does not prove that both headlights were illuminated when Officer [REDACTED] initially stopped him. Based on the conversation between Mr. [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] it is reasonable to conclude that Mr. [REDACTED] headlight was, in fact, not working when he was issued the citation.

VII. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis set forth above, COPA makes the following findings:

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer [REDACTED]	1. Mr. [REDACTED] alleged that on Feb. 23, 2018, at approximately 11:13pm, in the vicinity of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Road, the accused racially profiled him	Unfounded

³ Att. 21

⁴ Att. 9

⁵ At. 16

⁶ Att. 20

in that he stopped him because he was Black in Violation of Rule 6. 2. Mr. [REDACTED] alleged that on Feb. 23, 2018, the accused issued Mr. [REDACTED] a false ticket in Violation of Rule 2.	Unfounded
--	-----------

Approved:

[REDACTED]
First Deputy Chief Administrator

[REDACTED]
Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	11
Investigator:	[REDACTED]
Supervising Investigator:	[REDACTED]
Deputy Chief Administrator:	[REDACTED]